REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, 13-15, and 19 are amended. Therefore, claims 1-19 are presently pending. Amendment of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter is added.

I.   Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19, as amended, are described in the specification in, for example, Fig. 1, page 7, line 2 - page 8, line 10, and page 10, lines 3 – 18. The cited portions of the specification describe the information browser and device information provider recited in claims 1 and 10 and the browser function and the device information providing function recited in claim 19. The information browser and associated components are depicted in, for example, Fig. 1 as block A1. Similarly, the device information provider and associated components are depicted in Fig. 1 as block A2. As shown in Fig. 1, both information browser (A1) and device information provider (A2) include components for generating a layout tree. (e.g., K34 and K42). The information browser (A1) generates a layout tree containing layout information of the document data. (page 7, lines 8-15.) Similarly, the device information provider (A2) generates a layout tree of acquired device internal information. (page 10, lines 3 – 18.) Applicants submit that Fig. 1 and at least the cited portions of the specification provide a description sufficient to satisfy both the written description and enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-19 on these grounds be withdrawn.

II.   Claims Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al. (GB 2329309, published 17 March 1999) and further in view of Fisher et al. (US 2005/0091224, filed 22 October 2003).

Applicants submit that Berenek and Fisher, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations in claim 1. Specifically, the references fail to disclose or suggest:

> a device information provider comprising:
>
> an acquisition unit which <u>acquires the device internal information of the one or more information devices</u>;
>
> a generation unit <u>which generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information</u>; and
>
> a providing unit which provides the generated device-information-based layout tree to the rendering unit of the information browser, wherein the rendering unit <u>makes a display of the device internal information based on the device-information-based layout tree</u> provided from the providing unit of the device information provider.

(Emphasis added.)

Relevant portions of Beranek describe a proxy server for intercepting an HTTP Web document and altering its format to conform to the display capabilities of a client device or Web appliance. Beranek describes, "[t]he method preferably uses the client side HTTP caching proxy to intercept the Web document and then dynamically rewrites the document before it is displayed on the browser associated with the Web appliance." (Id. at 6:8-11, emphasis added.) Beranek also describes the ability to reserve display areas for presenting "emergency messages, status messages, advertising, other pages, and the like." (Beranek at 35:3-7.) While Berenek does detect information related to the display capabilities of the Web appliance, this information is never presented to the user. Because Beranek does not present information about the Web appliance to the user, there is no need to generate a layout tree containing the information about the Web appliance. Thus, Beranek does not "generate[] a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information" and make "a display of the device internal information based on the device-information-based layout tree," as recited in claim 1.

Fisher does not remedy deficiencies in the Beranek disclosure. Relevant portions of Fisher describe a method of combining variable data (*i.e.*, system information) with an HTML template to create an HTML document. (Fisher at paragraph 0018.) The HTML document in Fisher is transferred to a web-based client and displayed as a web page. (*Id.*) Assuming, *arguendo*, that the variable data of Fisher is analogous to the device internal information of claim 1, Fisher generates an HTML document. Thus, Fisher also does not "generate[] a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information," and make "a display of the device internal information based on the device-information-based layout tree," as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to the Web page creation and Web page display techniques of Fisher and Beranek, claim 1 recites a device information provider that acquires device internal information, generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information, and provides the generated device-information-based layout tree to a rendering unit of an information browser.

Accordingly, Beranek and Fisher either alone or in combination fail to disclose the device information provider that acquires device internal information and generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Beranek and Fisher fail to render claim 1 obvious.

Claim 10 also recites a device information provider that acquires device internal information and generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information. Claim 19 similarly recites a device information providing function, generating a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of acquired device internal information. For at least the reasons given above for claim 1, Beranek and Fisher also fail to render obvious independent claims 10 and 19. Dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also not rendered obvious for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-19 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **448252001600**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 5, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/_____
Peter J. Yim
   Registration No.: 44,417
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
(415) 268-6157